

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the non-final Office Action mailed December 10, 2008.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant is grateful to the Examiner for having indicated that claims 33-35 are allowed and that claims 11, 12, 15, 16 and 30-32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In order to expedite issuance of a patent, Applicant has rewritten claims 11, 12, 15, 16 and 30-32 in independent form including all of the limitations of the respective base claims and any intervening claims. As a result, newly amended independent claim 11 and its dependent claims 12-26 are believed to be allowable. Furthermore, newly amended independent claim 30 and its dependent claims 31-32 are believed to be allowable. Regarding claim 32, Applicant has voluntarily corrected a grammatical error by replacing the term "have" with the term "has". Claims 33-35 have been allowed, so no amendments have been to these claims.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102***

The Examiner has rejected claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Kiyono et al. (U.S. Patent 5,020,724). Although Applicant disagrees with the rejection of claim 40, Applicant has cancelled this claim without prejudice to possibly reasserting this claim in a continuation application.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 13, 17-27 and 36-48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious in view of Henshaw (U.S. Patent 5,217,163) and Kiyono et al. (U.S. Patent 5,020,724). Although Applicant disagrees with the rejection of claims 1-10, 13, 17-27 and 36-48, Applicant has

cancelled claims 1-10, 27 and 36-48 without prejudice to possibly reasserting these claims in a continuation application. Regarding claims 13 and 17-20, these claims have been amended to depend on newly amended claim 11 instead of on cancelled claim 1. Regarding claims 21-26, these original claims are now believed to be allowable because they depend ultimately on newly amended claim 11 by virtue of the amendment made to claim 20.

Claim 14 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious in view of Henshaw, Kiyono et al. and Heinz (U.S. Patent 6,424,078). Although Applicant disagrees with the rejection of claim 14, Applicant has amended this claim to depend on newly amended claim 11 instead of on cancelled claim 1.

Claims 28 and 29 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious in view of Henshaw, Kiyono et al. and Inoue (U.S. Patent 3,373,752). Although Applicant disagrees with the rejection of claims 28 and 29, Applicant has cancelled these claims without prejudice to possibly reasserting these claims in a continuation application.

As result of these rewritten claims, there are now three groups of claims in this application, namely:

- 1) apparatus claims 11 to 26;
- 2) apparatus claims 30 to 32; and
- 3) nozzle claims 33 to 35.

In view of the foregoing amendments, claims 11-26 and 30-35 are now believed to be allowable. Applicant looks forward to early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
**VIJAY, Mohan M et al.**



---

Matthew Roy  
Registration No. 48,074

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP  
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada K1P 1C3  
(613) 233-1781

March 2, 2009